



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,824	02/20/2002	John Kam Ho Lee	FAIRBRN-06792	3088

7590 12/24/2003

MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP
Suite 350
101 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

EXAMINER

GOINS, DAVETTA WOODS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2632

DATE MAILED: 12/24/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/081,824

Applicant(s)

HO LEE, JOHN KAM

Examiner

Davetta W. Goins

Art Unit

2632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vidovic (US Pat. 4,254,483).

In reference to claims 1, 5, Vidovic discloses the claimed alarm panel connected to an event sensor via cable, the cable comprising two conductors, and circuitry associated with the conductors for providing current to the event sensor and detecting changes in the current to indicate tampering at the sensor, severing of the cable and/or an event detected by the sensor, which is met by an ultrasonic intruder alarm comprising a processor 12 (control panel) connected to a plurality of receiver heads 18, used to detect a disturbance within an ultrasonic field (event sensor); a tamper detector, to detect tampering of one of the receiving heads 18 or of the cable; and a cut cable detector 110, used to determine whether the cable 20 has been cut (col. 8, lines 35-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vidovic in view of Armstrong (US Pat. 4,554,411).

In reference to claims 2, 6, although Vidovic does not specifically disclose the claimed two-conductor cable extending and providing a short six-conductor cable for connection to an existing alarm control panel, he does disclose a cable 20 connecting the processor 12 (control panel) to the plurality of receiver heads 18 (event sensors) (col. 2, lines 57-68 and Figure 1).

Armstrong discloses an intercom system comprising a control unit 100 connected by a common six wire cable 104 to one or more inside remote units (col. 2, lines 64-68; col. 3, lines 1-19).

Since Vidovic discloses an alarm system in which a processor (control panel) is attached to a plurality of receiver heads 18 (event sensors) via cable 20, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of using a six-conductor cable, as disclosed by Armstrong, with the system of Vidovic, as a commonly known in the art cable that provides paired lines to each sensor as a design choice for allowing transmitting/receiving signals to and from the control panel.

In reference to claims 3, 7, Vidovic discloses the claimed circuitry reacting to the current state of the conductors to provide appropriate conditions to each conductor of the cable for recognition by the alarm control panel, which is met by the detected human intruder will provide a signal to drive alarm relay 166 to operate either annunciator 14 or remotely located alarm device; a tamper detector providing a signal upon detecting removal of cover to the receiving head and/or a signal generated on line 238; the cut cable detector 110 develops a signal causing operation of LED 122, both the cut cable and tamper detector 112 will cause operation of LED 122, ect. (col. 8, lines 35-68). Although Vidovic does not specifically disclose the claimed shorting of the cable providing a maximum current state, an event detection by the sensor providing a medium current state, normal operating conditions providing a low current state, a severed cable or tampering with the event sensor providing a very low or no current state, he does disclose a cable connected from the processor 12 (control panel) to each receiver head 18 (event detectors), signals transmitted and received on the cable determine the alarm condition (col. 3, lines 6-68; col. 4, lines 1-68; col. 5, lines 1-58). Since Vidovic discloses a processor used for detecting various signals transmitted on cable 20 to determine which alarm has taken place, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use any level of current or voltage provided to represent a tamper, event sensor, or cut cable, to ensure that the control panel will issue the correct alarm.

In reference to claims 4, 8, although Vidovic does not specifically disclose the claimed even sensor is a passive infra-red detector, he does disclose the head receivers 18 comprised of ultrasonic sensors (col. 2, lines 57-68). Since it is well known in the art to use various types of

Art Unit: 2632

sensors to detect intrusion, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a passive infra-red detector with or in place of Vidovic's sensors, as a means to provide a warning signal upon determining a disturbance within a specified field.

5. The prior art of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure as follows. Galvin et al. (US Pat. 4,032,916) and Rothbaum et al. (US Pat. 5,543,782), which are references that include tamper-detecting alarm devices.

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Davetta W. Goins whose telephone number is 703-306-2761. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri with every other Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Wu can be reached on 703-308-6730. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 10/081,824

Page 6

Art Unit: 2632

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-7666.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Davetta W. Goins".

D.W.G.

December 17, 2003

Davetta W. Goins
Art Unit 2632